

DETROIT INTERMODAL FREIGHT TERMINAL PROJECT  
Draft Notes  
Local Advisory Council Meeting  
January 28, 2003, 7:00 p.m.  
LA SED

Purpose: To cooperate with the Local Advisory Council as the Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal Project advances in the EIS phase.

Attendance: See attachment.

Discussion:

Introductions

Following introductions, Mohammed Alghurabi noted that Representative Steve Tobocman was in attendance.

Review of Agenda

Mohammed Alghurabi asked for any comments or adjustments on the agenda. There were none.

Notes of December 17th Meeting

Mohammed indicated that the draft notes had been posted on the Web site on January 24<sup>th</sup>. However, he noted that they should have been posted earlier but that there had been a "glitch" in the system. Nevertheless, he asked if there were any comments or questions about the notes of the December 17<sup>th</sup> meeting. There were none.

Updated Approach

Joe Corradino was asked by Mohammed Alghurabi to explain the updated approach to the DIFT alternatives analysis. Joe Corradino, using a graphic that was made available to the members of the Local Advisory Council, indicated that Step 1 of the DIFT Project had largely been completed through the Mercer reports. Step 2 was the DIFT Feasibility Study, which resulted in the issuance of a Notice of Intent in March of 2002 by FHWA indicating that, in addition to the No-Action alternative, the other option was the refinement to Rail Strategy 3. He indicated that Step 3 would expand the number of

alternatives to include, in addition to No-Action and Rail Strategy 3 (the consolidated terminal plan, as modified), the examination of expanding/developing existing intermodal terminals.

Using graphics, Joe Corradino indicated that there are eight intermodal terminals in the southeastern Michigan region. One, Mazda, is self-contained and not available for commercial purposes. Therefore, it is not part of Alternative No. 2. On the other hand, Norfolk Southern operates four intermodal terminals in southeast Michigan. Those in Wayne County include NS/Oakwood and NS/Delray. These have been, or will be, consolidated at the Detroit-Livernois terminal (jointly-owned with CSX). Additionally, NS operates in Melvindale at the Triple Crown terminal. The intermodal activity here will also be transferred eventually to the Detroit-Livernois Terminal. As a result, there are four intermodal terminals considered for development in Alternative 2 (expand/develop existing intermodal terminals with federal funding assistance/oversight): 1) the Detroit-Livernois Yard, in Wayne County, jointly operated by CSX and Norfolk Southern; 2) the CP/Expressway terminal operated by Canadian Pacific in a location south of the Michigan Central Depot; 3) the CP/Oak terminal in the northwest corner of the Southfield Freeway and I-96; and, 4) the CN/Moterm terminal just north of 8-Mile Road and east of Woodward Avenue. Joe Corradino noted that a proposal for a new truck tunnel would affect the CP/Expressway terminal. Cooperation between the DIFT and that proposed project (which is being conducted by a partnership between Canadian Pacific and Borealis, an agent of the Ontario Employee Pension Fund) would be undertaken. Don Cameron noted that the trucks in the proposed tunnel would not be intermodal.

Joe Corradino indicated that an intermodal forecast would be associated with each of these four existing terminals with no expansion contemplated (Alternative 1). Alternative 2 would examine expansion of each existing terminal, if appropriate, based on a separate intermodal forecast for this option. Alternative 3, which contemplates consolidation of all intermodal activities conducted at these four terminals into the Detroit-Livernois Yard; would have a separate intermodal forecast. He noted that the forecasts of the past would be updated based upon a new approach to reflect data collected recently of both truck and container activity at each of the terminal sites.

Joe Corradino continued the discussion of the new approach by indicating that under Alternative 2, a discussion would be provided in the environmental document of the impacts associated with each of the four existing terminals. In the end, the impacts at each terminal would be added together so that an apples-to-apples comparison with the consolidated terminal alternative could be made.

Joe Corradino then indicated that the new schedule would move producing the DEIS from early summer of 2003 to spring of 2004. He anticipated that the FEIS would be completed by the end of 2004. He noted that a second scoping meeting for resource agencies would be conducted in late April or early May, 2003. He indicated that the updated approach would be initiated with a set of public meetings to be conducted on February 24<sup>th</sup> through February 27<sup>th</sup>, 2003 at locations around each of the four terminals that are considered part of the new alternative. Joe Corradino concluded his discussion by indicating that the Local Advisory Council would be expanded to provide representation from each of the terminal areas.

Father Joe Redican asked if intermodal activity was currently being conducted at Moterm. The response was yes. Greg Gorno noted that the containers at the CP/Expressway terminal were mostly domestic, and at the CP/Oak terminal mostly international. Father Redican asked if all four terminals would be “on the table” at the end of the process or would one or two be eliminated. Joe Corradino indicated that each would be included throughout the EIS process as each could be expanded under Alternative 2 with federal assistance and based upon the forecast of demand. In any case, investments outside the terminal for road and rail would be included in the consideration of each terminal’s development under Alternative 2.

Kathryn Savoie asked if all the terminals in southeastern Michigan had been, or will be, considered and if the terminals outside of southeastern Michigan can be studied in order to get a true representation of a regional system. Joe Corradino indicated that all intermodal terminals in southeastern Michigan were listed on the map used during the presentation. The alternatives would only focus on the region and not consider areas outside the region.

Reverend Archer asked if any one terminal cannot be expanded, would it be eliminated. Joe Corradino indicated that each of the terminals will be considered for expansion because federal and state funds will be available to assist in Alternative 2. No expansion is considered for any of the terminals in Alternative 1.

Herbert White asked about the existing terminals and how consolidation was currently taking place. Joe Corradino indicated that intermodal activity of the NS/Oakwood terminal had already been shifted to the Detroit-Livernois Yard by Norfolk Southern. Norfolk Southern had also indicated that it intended to consolidate its intermodal activity at the Triple Crown (Melvindale) and Delray (southwest Detroit) terminals into the Detroit-Livernois Yard. Joe Corradino noted that movement of intermodal business did not mean that those terminals would cease to be used for rail activity. He concluded by indicating that Norfolk Southern, along with CSX, had acquired Conrail's assets several years ago, including the Detroit-Livernois Yard. Therefore, his understanding is that the intermodal activity of both railroads in southeast Michigan would be focused on the Detroit-Livernois Yard.

Tom Drake of CSX indicated that Norfolk Southern is a separate company but, because of its partnership with CSX, he is aware that NS has made a decision that it is going to consolidate its intermodal operations at the Detroit-Livernois Yard. Whether or not they will do that is not a point of the DIFT study as a business decision has been made by NS to consolidate.

Karen Kavanaugh asked if there weren't nine terminals considered in the Mercer study and what happened to the Willow Run facility. Joe Corradino indicated that the nine facilities included the eight shown on the presentation graphic previously discussed plus the APL facility. APL has gone out of business. Finally, Joe Corradino noted that Willow Run is not a current intermodal facility. He did indicate that Willow Run was considered in the Mercer work as a possible location for intermodal railroad consolidation. However, it is not served by all four railroads and was eliminated as a finalist in the Mercer analysis. Karen Kavanaugh asked if it were possible to get a map of existing facilities that are owned by the railroads in the region. Tom Drake indicated that he would provide such a map for

his company. Karen Kavanaugh indicated that she would like to see those facilities for Wayne, Oakland and Macomb counties.

Kathryn Savoie noted that previous discussions with FHWA indicated that DIFT funding was restricted to Wayne County. Ferndale is not in Wayne County and, therefore, she asked if this poses a problem. Don Cameron indicated he does not think that this will be a problem.

Mohammed Alghurabi noted that efforts were underway to notify people in the CP/Expressway, CP/Oak and CN/Moterm areas of the upcoming meetings on the Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal Project. Likewise, the legislators at the city, county and state levels that represent these area will be notified in writing of the expanded alternatives analysis of the DIFT study.

Greg Gorno asked if the work under the updated approach was to bring Alternative 2 “up to speed” with the consolidated terminal. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that that was the case so that a fair comparison between expanding existing terminals and consolidating all intermodal activity at the Detroit-Livernois Yard could be made. Gerri Ayers indicated that the goal for each alternative is to accommodate the intermodal demand forecast for southeastern Michigan.

Herbert White asked if the containers would be stored in buildings. Joe Corradino indicated that there were virtually no buildings on the intermodal sites and that containers would be stored on the ground. Gerri Ayers indicated that storage was short-term (hours or days) not long-term (weeks). Greg Gorno indicated that containers are in transit virtually all the time, as it is cost-prohibitive to keep them stored at railroad yards.

Father Redican asked if one alternative will examine possible expansion at the Livernois Yard without federal investment. Joe Corradino indicated that it was unlikely that the footprint of the Detroit-Livernois Yard under either Alternative 1 (No Action) or Alternative 2 (Expand/Develop Existing Terminals) would be expanded. He noted it is likely that as intermodal traffic grew at this yard, more of

the existing terminal would be dedicated to intermodal activity rather than more property being dedicated to the terminal.

Father Redican asked whether the forecasts for each alternative would be made known to the LAC. The response was yes. Reverend Archer indicated that he now understood that each of the questions answered for the consolidation of railroad activity at the Detroit-Livernois Yard would also be answered for the expansion of the existing intermodal terminals without consolidation.

Kathryn Savoie asked if under Alternative 2 the Detroit-Livernois Yard would be expanding. Joe Corradino indicated that it was unlikely that it would be expanded. Some off-site improvements may be needed for rail operations, however. Additionally, it is unlikely that the truck-only road will be necessary under Alternative 2. Greg Gorno indicated that if the truck-only road is not part of Alternative 2, then the surface streets would be used by the trucks.

#### Proposed Local Area for Economic Impact

Joe Corradino displayed a map of the preliminary area for the definition of economic impacts (jobs and taxes lost and gained) to be associated with DIFT Alternatives 2 and 3. He asked for comments. Kathryn Savoie indicated that she still is not sure why freeways, like I-94, are considered boundaries for economic analysis. Joe Corradino explained that I-94 was used because he believed that the area north of I-94 relates much less to the activity, economics and otherwise, to the Detroit-Livernois Terminal, as does the area south of I-94. He indicated that if the desire of the LAC was to expand the area beyond I-94 to the north, then that would be done.

Kathryn Savoie indicated that she was concerned that the local area, as currently defined, would also be used for the analysis of environmental justice issues. Joe Corradino indicated that the area would be used for both analyses. He indicated that he believed the area shown did “tie together” in terms of many issues such as economics, environmental justice, and socioeconomic-related concerns such as community cohesion.

Reverend Archer asked whether it was practical to look at several local areas for each terminal. Joe Corradino indicated that it was not practical in light of the budget constraints. Gerri Ayers responded by saying that the economic impact analysis would be defined by other geographical areas, but only one local area per terminal. The other areas would include the remainder of Wayne County, outside the local area, as well as the other counties outside of Wayne County in the southeastern Michigan region.

Bruce King indicated that he agreed the local economic area displayed by Joe Corradino was appropriate. Reverend Archer indicated that he was comfortable as well. Hearing no further comments, it was noted that the area as shown would be used for the definition of local impacts for the Detroit-Livernois and CP/Expressway terminals.

#### Proposed Livernois Avenue Enhancement Project

Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that he believed the CSX and NS railroads were developing a letter(s) that will specify that they will invest in the Livernois Enhancement Project. He indicated that the city of Detroit will have to play a role in sponsoring the project and maintaining it.

Karen Kavanaugh asked whether the enhancement project was the same as the one that was displayed earlier. Joe Corradino indicated that the design had been modified so that, instead of the entire \$4 million project, a first increment that could be funded at about \$1 million was now being advanced. Karen Kavanaugh asked about the timeline for the improvement. Joe Corradino indicated that it would be coordinated with the near-term improvements by NS and CSX to the Detroit-Livernois Yard. Therefore, it is likely that it will be done within the next 12 to 18 months.

Tom Drake indicated that the commitment by the railroads to enhance Livernois Avenue is one of several agreements that NS and CSX are now assembling so that they can improve the existing intermodal terminal. He noted that there were other activities that were pending dealing with drainage issues and permits associated with these improvements. Until those matters are resolved, and all

agreements reached between CSX and NS and, then, with the State, the construction could not be started. He noted the current rail yard expansion is not dependent on the DIFT Project.

Karen Kavanaugh asked if construction would start in the spring of 2003 as the railroads had indicated earlier. Tom Drake responded that he did not believe so as it was difficult to obtain permits.

Karen Kavanaugh asked if it were possible the construction will be delayed until 2004. Tom Drake responded that something needs to be done sooner rather than later.

Father Redican indicated that he supports beautification of Livernois Avenue but stressed that when it rains, the water on Livernois Avenue at the railroad underpass is "as deep as a car's window." He urged this fundamental problem be dealt with. Joe Corradino indicated that he believed the drainage problem was partly a function of the silt running off the Livernois Yard, clogging the sewer inlet. He believed that problem would be addressed by the improvements that CSX and NS were now contemplating.

Bruce King said that the City has a concern about the Livernois Enhancement Project that needs to be addressed in that one lane of Livernois Avenue was likely to be incorporated into the project. Joe Corradino indicated that the project's first phase for about \$1 million did not include taking a lane from Livernois Avenue. However, it did include fixing the sidewalk on the west side of Livernois Avenue. Father Redican indicated that he believed that it was not fair to hold up the project with the concern of taking a driving lane from Livernois Avenue. He believed that the street was wide enough to function without at least one lane. Bruce King noted that the City would take the matter under advisement once the State requested its participation as both the sponsor and the agency to maintain the project.

#### Field Office

Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that the DIFT field office on Livernois Avenue, opposite the Detroit-Livernois Terminal, would be closed when the lease expired. Bruce King suggested that it might be



appropriate to have some presence around each of the CP/Oak, CP/Expressway and CN/Moterm terminals for a short period of time. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that the matter would be addressed to appropriately respond to Bruce's suggestion.

#### Next Meeting

It was decided that the next LAC meeting would be the 20<sup>th</sup> of February at LA SED which time the presentation for the public meetings would be made available in draft form for comment by the LAC.

#### Other Issues

Kathryn Savoie requested that the fee be waived on all information requests of MDOT for LAC participants. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that he would discuss the request with appropriate MDOT parties. Reverend Archer suggested that anyone on the LAC should bring their list of information requests to each meeting so that it can be formally presented to MDOT. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that regardless of the decision on the fee waiver, that any LAC information request be brought to his attention so he could address it, to the extent possible.

#### Public Comment

Margaret Gary urged MDOT to consider using the three terminals from which Norfolk Southern was going to relocate its intermodal activity to the Detroit-Livernois Yard. Greg Gorno responded by indicating that those three yards are very small.

Margaret Gary asked about an analysis of spin-off impacts on the transportation networks as a result of intermodal activity. Joe Corradino indicated that such an analysis will be conducted. He noted that work included in the Mercer reports indicated that the spin-off effects on the transportation network were more positive than negative through intermodal consolidation. This included a reduction in the vehicles miles of travel and air pollution on a regional/network-wide basis.

Margaret Gary asked if the freeways as far as three miles away from a terminal were incorporated in the analysis. Joe Corradino indicated that a regional approach was examined in the Mercer report.

He noted through that work that as many as 1,500 trucks a day could be removed from I-94 as they travel between the proposed consolidated terminal and Chicago. He also indicated that the regional analysis would be updated in the EIS. Margaret Gary again indicated that the study should identify impacts on Detroit freeways. Joe Corradino responded that a specific impact on each freeway in the regional network will not be done in the EIS. However, an overall regional approach in terms of miles of travel, pollution generated, and crashes encountered will be undertaken.

Kelly Kioshk asked why the word "impacts" was used in the discussions. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that the word is a term of art, associated with preparing an environmental impact statement. Gerri Ayers responded by saying that the National Environmental Policy Act guidelines require the measurement of impacts associated with a federal action.

Kelly Kioshk indicated that the reason he asked why the word "impacts" is used is because what is done in Detroit affects his Indian people at home. He noted that his people are dying of cancer. He noted that the impacts around the city are not good because of all the related business activity. He stated that common sense has to be used to protect the area's quality of life. He stressed that not enough common sense was being used. He noted, again, that all the things that are taking place are affecting his Indian people. He indicated that he attends many of these types of meetings trying to do his part to protect his people.

*L:\Projects\2846-A\WP\notes\LocalAdvisory\LocalAdv.041.doc*

# DETROIT INTERMODAL FREIGHT TERMINAL PROJECT

## Draft Notes

### Local Advisory Council Meeting

January 28, 2003, 7:00 p.m.

LA SED

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Phone</u>
Rev. Steve Archer	Trinity St. Marks	
Mohammed Alghurabi	MDOT-Design	517-373-7674
Harold L. Berry	Detroit Fire Department	313-237-2656
Don Cameron	FHWA	517-702-1826
Tom Drake	CSX	734-464-4948
Freddie Feliciano	Mayor's Office	313-224-3817
Greg Gorno	DIA/GTSI	734-281-1666
Karen Kavanaugh	SDBA/CBRA	
Bruce King	City	313-471-5103
Fr. Joe Redican	Holy Redeemer	313-841-1433
Kathryn Savoie	ACCESS/CBRA	313-216-2225
<u>Observers</u>		
Ari Adler	The Corradino Group	517-333-6560
Gerri Ayers	MDOT	517-373-2227
Mickey Blashfield	CENTRA	
Joe Corradino	The Corradino Group	313-964-1926
Jeff Edwards	MDOT	248-483-5114
JoAnn El Hajj	ACCESS/CBRA	313-216-2226
Brian Foster	The Sterling Group	517-267-9012
Margaret Gary	Mexicantown CDC	313-967-9898
Jim Hartman	The Corradino Group	313-964-1926
Kelly Kioshk	Amer. Indian Health Svcs.	
Stephanie Litaker	MDOT	517-335-3084
Harvey Santana	The Corradino Group	313-964-1926
Olga Savic	State Rep.	517-373-0823
Steve Tobocman	State Rep.	517-373-0823
Herbert White	Detroit Fire Department	313-596-2973

L:\Projects\2846-A\WP\notes\LocalAdvisory\LocalAdv.041.doc